

in the December notification relating to the CBT wheat futures contract. The Commission is of the view that the public has an important role to fulfill and a critical interest in a full airing of these issues. Accordingly, the Commission is hereby separately requesting written data and views from interested members of the public relating to the CBT wheat contract. The submission of data relating to cash market flows of No. 2 soft red winter wheat, relevant locational price differentials, and other relevant economic evidence would be especially useful. Commenters are specifically requested to address the following issues:

1. Does a problem exist with regard to the current delivery specifications of the CBT wheat contract? If so, to what extent is the problem a lack of adequate deliverable supplies at Chicago, Toledo, and St. Louis? With respect to Toledo and St. Louis, are the differentials on the contract set appropriately to reflect cash market price differentials? What is the economic deliverable capacity at St. Louis in light of the through-put nature of the facilities located there?

2. To what extent do the current CBT delivery specifications for wheat reflect flows of wheat in the cash market? To the extent that the delivery terms of the futures contract differ from the wheat flows in the cash market, does this have any detrimental impact on the trading of the wheat futures contract or on the cash market for wheat?

3. What is the likely effect of a failure to modify the current delivery terms of the contract?

4. What alternative delivery specifications are available to increase deliverable supplies on the contract?

In this respect, commenters are requested to address the following questions, supplying, to the extent available, economic data or studies in support of their conclusions:

a. Given the declining role of Chicago as a cash market for wheat, should it be retained as a delivery point on the futures contract?

b. What are the advantages and disadvantages of expanding the Toledo, Ohio delivery point to encompass off-water elevators in neighboring counties?

c. What are the advantages and disadvantages of expanding the St. Louis, Missouri delivery point to encompass river stations and off-water elevators in neighboring counties?

d. What are the advantages and disadvantages of permitting delivery at St. Louis via shipping certificates, rather than warehouse receipts? Should such shipping certificates be backed by warehouse receipts at or near that

location or by financial guarantees of performance?

e. If delivery at St. Louis by shipping certificate is advisable, should other delivery points on the contract also provide for delivery by shipping certificate? Is consistency of delivery instrument among delivery points necessary or desirable? What is the likely effect of lack of consistency in the type of delivery instrument for different delivery points?

f. What are the advantages and disadvantages of providing for delivery via shipping certificates at elevators located: (i) On the Mississippi River located between St. Louis and Memphis or (ii) on the Mississippi River between St. Louis and Cairo and (iii) on the Ohio River between Cairo and Louisville, Kentucky?

g. What are the advantages and disadvantages of specifying delivery to lower Mississippi River export elevators?

5. Is there a single location, or a limited number of locations, that offer either sufficient stocks or receive sufficient flows of one class of wheat adequate to support futures trading and to tend to prevent or diminish price manipulation, market congestion or the abnormal movement of such commodity in interstate commerce?

Issued in Washington, D.C., this 1st day of July, 1997 by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

Jean A. Webb,

Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 97-17721 Filed 7-7-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6351-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

ACTION: Notice.

The Department of Defense has submitted to OMB for clearance, the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Title and Associated Form: Direct Deposit Authorization, DD Form X311, OMB Number 0730—[To Be Determined].

Type of Request: New Collection.

Number of Respondents: 252,000.

Responses per Respondent: 1.

Annual Responses: 252,000.

Average Burden per Response: 30 minutes.

Annual Burden Hours: 126,000.

Needs and Uses: This collection of information is necessary to meet the Department of Defense and the Department of Treasury's requirements to process civilian and military personnel requests to authorize direct deposits of net payments, travel payments, and savings allotments to financial institutions to which payment is to be directed. The information is required by the Treasury Financial Manual, Bulletin No. 95-07, dated December 16, 1994, and DoD Financial Management Regulation, Volume 5. The Direct Deposit Authorization form will be used for all DoD personnel including civilians, active and retired military, and annuitants. The form will be completed and signed by the payee and forwarded to their paying office. The information can be obtained from the payee's banking documents. The paying office will enter the Direct Deposit enrollment information into the payroll system, and at the same time assure proper identification of the payee. The data will be forwarded to the payee's financial institution by the servicing Federal Reserve Bank.

Affected Public: Individuals or Households.

Frequency: On Occasion.

Respondent's Obligation: Required to Obtain or Retain Benefits.

OMB Desk Officer: Mr. Edward C. Springer.

Written comments and recommendations on the proposed information collection should be sent to Mr. Springer at the Office of Management and Budget, Desk Officer for DoD, Room 10236, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

DOD Clearance Officer: Mr. Robert Cushing.

Written requests for copies of the information collection proposal should be sent to Mr. Cushing, WHS/DIOR, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302.

Dated: July 1, 1997.

Patricia L. Toppings,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 97-17711 Filed 7-7-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000-04-M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Defense Science Board Task Force on Underground Facilities

ACTION: Notice of advisory committee meetings.

SUMMARY: The Defense Science Board Task Force on Underground Facilities